

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 15, 16, and 20-30 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,477,543 of Huang ("Huang"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claim 1 sets forth a **record extraction sequence identification (ID)**. In contrast, Huang fails to disclose at least a record extraction sequence ID.

According to Huang, the client and the remote host are synchronized using sync logic and transformation code (Huang, col. 8, ln.10-45). The sync logic determines the update direction for each data item of the application in the handheld device and in the replica host (Huang, col. 8, ln. 53-65). The transformation code is used to transform data from one format into another format during synchronization (Huang, col. 13, ln. 32-52). The transformation code and the sync logic in Huang are not record extraction sequence ID. Furthermore, the transformation code and the sync logic in Huang are not even related to record extraction sequence. Therefore, Huang fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 set forth a record extraction sequence ID and thus, are not anticipated by Huang for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26, respectively. Therefore, having additional limitations, claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are not anticipated by Huang for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,831,664 of Wharton (“Wharton”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,000,000 of Hawkins (“Hawkins”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Claim 1 sets forth a **record extraction sequence identification (ID)**. In contrast, both Wharton and Hawkins fail to disclose at least a record extraction sequence ID.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Wharton fails to disclose a record extraction sequence ID (Office Action, p. 4, ln. 5-9). However, it is alleged in the Office Action that Hawkins discloses a record extraction sequence ID.

According to Hawkins, application interfaces (APIs) are provided in the system to “sequentially locate the next altered record” using “an exact record lookup” (Hawkins, col. 11, ln. 60-63; emphasis added). In other words, Hawkins merely discloses **APIs** for sequentially locating the next altered record and looking up the exact record. APIs are not identifications (ID). Hawkins does not disclose a record extraction sequence **ID**.

Furthermore, the mere disclosure of APIs for sequentially locating the next altered record and looking up the exact record does not suggest or imply a record extraction sequence ID. Therefore, like Wharton, Hawkins fails to disclose at least a record extraction sequence ID.

Since neither Wharton nor Hawkins disclose at least the limitation of a record extraction sequence ID, Wharton and Hawkins do not render claim 1 obvious for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claims 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 set forth a record extraction sequence ID, and thus, are patentable over Wharton in view of Hawkins for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26, respectively. Therefore, having additional limitations, claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-30 are patentable over Wharton in view of Hawkins for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 16, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300